EXHIBIT 9 FILED UNDER SEAL

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 2319-7 Filed 12/01/17 Page 2 of 11 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
2
        NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3
            SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
4
           Case No. 17-cv-00939-WHA
5
6
   WAYMO LLC,
7
                Plaintiff,
8
        - against -
9
   UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; OTTOMOTTO, LLC;
10 OTTO TRUCKING LLC,
1|1
                Defendants.
1|2
  -----x
1|3
1 4
     HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
15
16
              Videotaped 30(b)(6) Deposition
17 of GARY BROWN, taken by Defendants, held
18 at the offices of Morrison & Foerster LLP,
   250 West 55th Street, at 9:59 a.m. on August
19 8, 2017, New York, New York, before Jineen
   Pavesi, a Registered Professional Reporter,
20 Registered Merit Reporter, Certified Realtime
   Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New York.
2|1
2|2
2|3
24 Job No. 2671217A
25 Pages 1 - 305
                                               Page 1
```

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 2319-7 Filed 12/01/17 Page 3 of 11 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	correct?		12:13:05PM
2	Α.	You would have to ask Kristinn	12:13:06PM
3	that.		12:13:09PM
4	Q.	Does Waymo know who gave	12:13:09PM
5	Mr. Gudjons	son the laptops?	12:13:14PM
6	Α.	Presumably either Chelsea or	12:13:18PM
7	Leah had de	livered it.	12:13:26PM
8	Q.	But you don't know strike	12:13:28PM
9	that.		12:13:30PM
10		Waymo does not know if it was	12:13:30PM
1	Chelsea or	Leah who gave Gudjonsson the	12:13:32PM
12	laptops?		12:13:36PM
13	Α.	No.	12:13:37PM
14	Q.	I would like to direct your	12:13:45PM
15	attention t	o 29419, the next page, listed	12:13:46PM
16	under CAMP	devices, you see the second	12:13:52PM
17	bullet poin	t, Asset No. 1028251, do you	12:13:55PM
18	see that?		12:14:00PM
19	Α.	I do.	12:14:00PM
20	Q.	And that asset being listed	12:14:02PM
21	there is a	Hewlett-Packard workstation,	12:14:05PM
22	correct?		12:14:08PM
23	Α.	Yes.	12:14:09PM
24	Q.	And that workstation was issued	12:14:10PM
25	to Mr. Leva	ndowski on November 7, 2012,	12:14:12PM
			Page 96

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 2319-7 Filed 12/01/17 Page 4 of 11 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1		correct?	12:14:17PM
2		A. That seems accurate.	12:14:17PM
3		Q. And it was returned on February	12:14:19PM
4		9, 2016, is that correct?	12:14:24PM
5		A. That means it was collected and	12:14:28PM
6		brought back by the inventory people on	12:14:30PM
7		February 9, 2016, yes.	12:14:33PM
8		Q. And then approximately 15 days	12:14:36PM
9		later, on February 24, 2016, that	12:14:41PM
1	0	workstation was reallocated to an	12:14:44PM
1	1	individual named Jerry Anderson, is that	12:14:48PM
1	2	correct?	12:14:51PM
1	3	A. That's what this says.	12:14:51PM
1	4	Q. And Waymo performed no forensic	12:14:53PM
1	5	investigation into the workstation	12:14:56PM
1	6	assigned to Mr. Levandowski for an over	12:14:59PM
1	7	three-year period during his employment at	12:15:03PM
1	8	Waymo, is that correct?	12:15:06PM
1	9	MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	12:15:07PM
2	0	A. When an employee is terminated,	12:15:09PM
2	1	tickets are generated for inventory	12:15:12PM
2	2	management individuals to collect their	12:15:15PM
2	3	assets, check if that individual is	12:15:18PM
2	4	currently on a hold that would forbid	12:15:25PM
2	5	reimage, and then the asset is either	12:15:30PM
			Page 97

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 2319-7 Filed 12/01/17 Page 5 of 11 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1		retired or r	efurbished and redeployed if	12:15:37PM
2		deemed still	within its life span.	12:15:44PM
3		Q.	Waymo performed no forensic	12:15:51PM
4		investigatio	n into the Hewlett-Packard	12:15:52PM
5		workstation	assigned to Mr. Levandowski	12:15:55PM
6		for an over	three-year period during his	12:15:58PM
7		employment a	t Waymo, is that correct?	12:16:00PM
8			MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	12:16:02PM
9		Α.	That is correct.	12:16:07PM
1	0	Q.	The Hewlett-Packard workstation	12:16:11PM
1	1	assigned to	Mr. Levandowski from 2012 to	12:16:13PM
1	2	2016 is a co	mputer is it a desktop	12:16:19PM
1	3	computer?		12:16:26PM
1	4	Α.	It appears to be, yes.	12:16:27PM
1	5	Q.	And that would have existed in	12:16:28PM
1	б	his office a	t Waymo, right?	12:16:31PM
1	7	Α.	Presumably.	12:16:34PM
1	8	Q.	And it would have been	12:16:35PM
1	9	something he	used in the three-and-a-half	12:16:36PM
2	0	year period	that it was assigned to him in	12:16:40PM
2	1	his office a	t Waymo, correct?	12:16:43PM
2	2		MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	12:16:44PM
2	3	Α.	Possibly, but not necessarily.	12:16:46PM
2	4	Q.	But you don't know one way or	12:16:51PM
2	5	the other if	he used it?	12:16:52PM
				Page 98

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 2319-7 Filed 12/01/17 Page 6 of 11 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	A. No.	12:16:53PM
2	Q. And nobody asked you to	12:16:54PM
3	inquire, to conduct a forensic review of	12:16:58PM
4	that device to determine if he did	12:17:00PM
5	anything improper with it, correct?	12:17:07PM
6	A. That is correct, but with the	12:17:13PM
7	caveat that the lack of analysis of	12:17:17PM
8	another machine does not wash away the	12:17:22PM
9	wrongdoings on another machine, that's no	12:17:25PM
10	indication of not doing something.	12:17:28PM
1	Q. In order to determine the full	12:17:35PM
12	scope of potential wrongdoing, in your	12:17:39PM
13	opinion should Waymo have conducted a	12:17:43PM
14	forensic investigation of the	12:17:46PM
15	Hewlett-Packard workstation?	12:17:47PM
16	MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	12:17:49PM
17	A. All feasible rocks should be	12:17:57PM
18	turned over, but there have been multiple	12:18:02PM
19	occurrences where inventory management	12:18:07PM
20	personnel reimaged devices before forensic	12:18:12PM
21	analysis could take place.	12:18:18PM
22	Q. And in your opinion, one	12:18:22PM
23	feasible rock that should have been turned	12:18:29PM
24	over was a review of the Hewlett-Packard	12:18:30PM
25	workstation assigned to Mr. Levandowski,	12:18:34PM
		Page 99

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 2319-7 Filed 12/01/17 Page 7 of 11 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1	is that corr	rect?	12:18:37PM
2		MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	12:18:37PM
3	Α.	As a forensic analyst, the more	12:18:42PM
4	information,	the better.	12:18:44PM
5		But as I said before, it	12:18:47PM
6	doesn't undo	o other indicators that were	12:18:50PM
7	positively f	Found.	12:18:55PM
8	Q.	As a forensic analyst, wouldn't	12:19:02PM
9	you want to	know if the card reader was	12:19:07PM
10	attached to	the workstation?	12:19:09PM
11	_	MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	12:19:11PM
12	2 A.	Yes.	12:19:18PM
13	g.	But you don't know the answer	12:19:19PM
14	to that ques	stion, right?	12:19:21PM
15	A.	Not currently.	12:19:24PM
16	Q.	Waymo would never know the	12:19:26PM
17	answer to the	nat question, correct?	12:19:29PM
18	3	MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	12:19:31PM
19	А.	That's uncertain.	12:19:43PM
20	Q.	Why is that uncertain?	12:19:45PM
21	Α.	Depending on retention and host	12:19:50PM
22	2 monitoring a	agents, it could potentially be	12:20:00PM
23	determined w	whether some classes of USB	12:20:08PM
24	devices were	e connected to these machines,	12:20:12PM
25	but I also v	would not feel comfortable	12:20:16PM
			Page 100

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 2319-7 Filed 12/01/17 Page 8 of 11 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS EYES ONLY

1		saying that	an absence of this evidence	12:20:19PM
2		means that	it didn't happen.	12:20:22PM
3		Q.	But you don't know one way or	12:20:25PM
4		the other i	f it happened?	12:20:27PM
5		Α.	As I sit here today, no.	12:20:28PM
6			MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	12:20:29PM
7		Q.	Sorry, I didn't catch your	12:20:30PM
8		answer to t	hat question.	12:20:31PM
9		Α.	As I sit here right now, no.	12:20:32PM
1	0	Q.	And Waymo doesn't know one way	12:20:35PM
1	1	or the othe	r if a card reader was attached	12:20:37PM
1	2	to the work	station, correct?	12:20:40PM
1	3		MR. BAKER: Same objection.	12:20:42PM
1	4	Α.	No.	12:20:43PM
1	5	Q.	Has Waymo attempted to conduct	12:20:56PM
1	6	any forensi	c investigation into the	12:20:58PM
1	7	Hewlett-Pac	kard workstation since it was	12:21:00PM
1	8	reassigned	to Jerry Anderson?	12:21:04PM
1	9	Α.	I don't believe so.	12:21:13PM
2	0	Q.	So	12:21:18PM
2	1	Α.	And also, so these machines are	12:21:19PM
2	2	full disk e	ncrypted, that is to say, as	12:21:24PM
2	3	they are re	imaged and redeployed there is	12:21:26PM
2	4	no evidence	left on the hard drive, much	12:21:31PM
2	5	like when y	ou take your Windows laptop and	12:21:33PM
				Page 101

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 2319-7 Filed 12/01/17 Page 9 of 11 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

```
1
                UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
               NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 2
 3
                   SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
4
5
     WAYMO LLC,
                                    )
                  Plaintiff,
6
 7
                                   ) Case No.
             VS.
     UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; ) 3:17-cv-000939-WHA
8
9
     OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING, )
10
     INC.,
11
                  Defendants. )
12
        HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
13
14
15
       VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF KRISTINN GUDJONSSON
16
                   Palo Alto, California
17
                   Friday, July 28, 2017
18
                          Volume I
19
20
    Reported by:
21
    CARLA SOARES
    CSR No. 5908
22
23
    JOB No. 2665814
24
    PAGES 1 - 242
25
                                                 Page 1
```

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 2319-7 Filed 12/01/17 Page 10 of 11 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1	today, you are not aware of any evidence that	15:29:57
2	Mr. Levandowski copied files off the computer before	
3	it was reimaged?	
4	MR. BAKER: Objection to form.	
5	THE WITNESS: I can only tell you what's	15:30:06
6	in the declaration here, what we see here.	
7	BY MR. TAKASHIMA:	
8	Q To your knowledge, has there been any	
9	investigation of Mr. Levandowski's e-mail account at	
10	Google?	15:30:53
11	A I'm not sure.	
12	Q To your knowledge, has anybody connected	
13	with an investigation reviewed the contents of	
14	Mr. Levandowski's e-mail account at Google?	
15	A I'm not sure.	15:31:05
16	Q Who would know?	
17	A Lawyers.	
18	Q Would anybody else in digital forensics	
19	know?	
20	A Potentially, but probably not. It	15:31:22
21	probably would have been me if that check was made.	
22	Q Have you conducted been involved in any	
23	review of Mr. Levandowski's workstation from Google?	
24	A The workstation, no.	
25	Q Has anybody else from digital forensics	15:31:42
		Page 198

Case 3:17-cv-00939-WHA Document 2319-7 Filed 12/01/17 Page 11 of 11 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

1	conducted that investigation?	15:31:44
2	A No.	
3	Q Has anybody looked at Mr. Levandowski's	
4	workstation?	
5	A Not to my knowledge.	15:31:49
6	Q Has the workstation been preserved?	
7	A Not to my knowledge.	
8	Q Okay. Has it been deleted?	
9	A I'm not sure. I would have to go check.	
10	Q Did you ever discuss with anybody	15:32:07
11	investigating Mr. Levandowski's workstation?	
12	MR. BAKER: Again, I just want to caution	
13	the witness not to disclose any communications that	
14	he's had with attorneys.	
15	If you have a question, we can go outside.	15:32:22
16	MR. TAKASHIMA: Do you want to take a	
17	break?	
18	THE WITNESS: Yes. Let's do that.	
19	THE VIDEO OPERATOR: We are now going off	
20	the record, and the time is 3:32.	15:32:31
21	(Recess, 3:32 p.m 3:39 p.m.)	
22	THE VIDEO OPERATOR: We're now going back	
23	on the record, and the time is 3:39.	
24	BY MR. TAKASHIMA:	
25	Q Did you ever discuss with anybody whether	15:39:05
		Page 199